arXiv:1411.6614v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 24 Nov 2014

2D Local Hamiltonian with area laws is QMA-complete

Yichen Huang
Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California 94720, USA
yichenhuang@berkeley.edu

November 25, 2014

Abstract

We show that the 2D local Hamiltonian problem with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws is QMA-complete. We also prove similar results in 2D translationally invariant systems and for the 3D Heisenberg and Hubbard models. Consequently, in general the ground states of local Hamiltonians satisfying area laws do not have efficient classical representations that support efficient computation of local expectation values unless QMA=NP. Conceptually, even if in the future area laws are proved for the ground state in 2D gapped systems, there is still a long way to go towards understanding the computational complexity of 2D gapped systems.

1 Introduction

Computing the ground state of local Hamiltonians is a fundamental problem in condensed matter physics. Intuitively, this problem is likely intractable because the dimension of the Hilbert space for a quantum many-body system grows exponentially with the system size. In a pioneering work [17] (see [2] for a write-up available online), Kitaev defined the complexity class QMA as the quantum analog of NP (or more precisely, the quantum analog of MA) and proved that the local Hamiltonian problem with 5-body interactions is QMA-complete. This work is followed by a line of research: The local Hamiltonian problem is QMA-complete even in (a) qubit systems with 2-body interactions [16, 20]; (b) 1D quantum systems with nearest-neighbor interactions [1, 10]; (c) 1D translationally invariant systems [15, 9] (the result of Ref. [9] is $\mathrm{QMA}_{\mathrm{EXP}}$-complete due to a technical reason to be explained in Section 3); (d) 2D Heisenberg and Hubbard models [23] (see [4] for a summary of QMA-complete problems). Consequently, (assuming QMA$\neq$NP) in general the ground states of local Hamiltonians do not have efficient classical representations that support efficient computation of local expectation values. Here, the first "efficient" means that the classical representation uses a polynomial number of bits, and the second "efficient" means that local expectation values can be computed in polynomial time from the classical representation. It should be emphasized that the latter "efficient" is crucial. Indeed, (assuming nondegeneracy) the local Hamiltonian itself is an efficient classical representation of its ground state as it is the sum of a polynomial number of terms, but (assuming QMA$\neq$P) this trivial representation does not support efficient computation of local expectation values.

Entanglement appears to be a central concept from an algorithmic perspective. Generic states in quantum many-body systems satisfy the volume law–the entanglement of a region scales as the number of sites inside (i.e., the volume of) the region [12]. Perhaps surprisingly, a large class of physical states satisfy the area law [5]–the entanglement of a region scales as its boundary (area). Besides its beautiful mathematical formulation, area law is gaining popularity in the emerging field

of quantum Hamiltonian complexity [21, 8] because it does capture the essence of classical simulability of 1D quantum systems: Bounded (or even logarithmic divergence of) Renyi entanglement entropy across all bipartite cuts implies [27] efficient matrix product state (MPS) representations [6, 29, 22], which underlie the celebrated density matrix renormalization group algorithm [32, 33]. Since local expectation values of MPS can be computed efficiently, we conclude that the 1D local Hamiltonian problem with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws is in NP. Furthermore, a structural result from the proof [11, 3, 13] of the area law for the ground state of 1D gapped Hamiltonians is an essential ingredient of the (provably) polynomial-time algorithm [18, 14] for computing such states, establishing that the 1D gapped Hamiltonian problem is in P.

2D (and 3D) quantum systems can host exotic phases of matter, and are much more exciting and challenging. Indeed, little rigorous results are known for 2D quantum systems from an algorithmic perspective. Whether area laws hold for the ground states in 2D gapped systems is one of the most well-known open problems in the field of Hamiltonian complexity. Ambitiously, one may ask (1) Which class of 2D ground states has efficient classical representations that support efficient computation of local expectation values? (2) If such classical representations exist, can we find them efficiently? A lot of effort has been devoted to extending methods and tools from 1D to 2D. Tensor network states [28] are generalizations of MPS to higher dimensions. Examples include projected entangled pair states [26] and the multiscale entanglement renormalization ansatz [30], which, respectively, do not [24] and does [31] support efficient computation of local expectation values. It is commonly believed that physical states satisfying area laws have efficient tensor network state representations. This belief is not provable before "physical" is defined. We do not attempt to define such a notion here, but rather rely on intuitions to judge what is physical. For instance, the ground states of local Hamiltonians are more physical than generic states in quantum many-body systems, and translationally invariant Hamiltonians on a regular lattice with nearest-neighbor interactions are more physical than generic local Hamiltonians.

In contrast to the belief, it was recently proved that there exist quantum states satisfying area laws for all Renyi entanglement entropies but do not have efficient classical representations [7]. The main idea of the proof is so elegant that we would like to sketch here. The authors of Ref. [7] consider the question: How large is the space of all states satisfying area laws? They explicitly construct a set S such that (i) S is parameterized by an exponential number of independent parameters; (ii) all states in S satisfy area laws. Consequently, a generic state in S cannot be approximated using a polynomial number of bits (as the volume of S is too large) and does not have efficient classical representations. This counting approach is very powerful: It applies to any classical representation, regardless of whether the classical representation supports efficient computation of local expectation values. We conclude that a generic state in S is not only not a tensor network state of polynomial bond dimension, but also not a (nondegenerate) eigenstate of local Hamiltonians [7].

In this Brief Report, we show that the 2D local Hamiltonian problem with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws is QMA-complete (Corollary 1). We also prove similar results in 2D translationally invariant systems (Corollary 2) and for the 3D Heisenberg (Proposition 1) and Hubbard (Proposition 2) models. Consequently, (assuming QMA$\neq$NP) in general the ground states of local Hamiltonians satisfying area laws still do not have efficient classical representations that support efficient computation of local expectation values. The result of Ref. [7] is incomparable to ours: Ref. [7] considers general states in quantum many-body systems while we limit ourselves to the ground states of local Hamiltonians, which are more physical. Technically, the counting approach, which is the key to the result of Ref. [7], does not work in our context. It should be emphasized that our results are not intended for diminishing the importance of area laws. A proof of (or a counterexample to) area laws for the ground state in 2D gapped systems is, in our opinion, a landmark achievement, which probably requires the development of powerful new techniques.

However, even if such area laws are proved, it is just a starting point and there is still a long way to go towards understanding the computational complexity of 2D gapped systems.

2 Preliminaries

We begin with the definition of the lattice Hamiltonian problem, which is the local Hamiltonian problem tailored to the context that the Hamiltonian acts on a regular lattice with nearest-neighbor interactions (and on-site terms). Accounting for the finite precision of numerical computing, hereafter, every real number is assumed to be represented by a polynomial number of bits.

Definition 1 (lattice Hamiltonian problem)**.** Consider a quantum many-body system of spins (or bosons, fermions) arranged on a regular lattice. We are given a Hamiltonian H (which is the sum of nearest-neighbor interactions) and a real number a with the promise that either (Yes) $\lambda(H) \leq a$ or (No) $\lambda(H) \geq a + \delta$, where $\lambda(H)$ denotes the ground-state energy of H, and δ is some inverse polynomial in the system size. We must decide which is the case.

QMA is the class of problems that can be efficiently verified by a quantum computer. Below is a formal definition of QMA based on quantum circuits.

Definition 2 (QMA [17])**.** A problem is in QMA if there is a uniform family of polynomial-size quantum circuits $\{V_x\}$ (one for each input instance x) such that:
(i) If x is a yes instance, then there exists a quantum state $|y\rangle$ of polynomial-size such that V_x accepts $|y\rangle$ with probability greater than 2/3;
(ii) If x is a no instance, then for any quantum state $|y\rangle$ of polynomial-size V_x accepts $|y\rangle$ with probability less than 1/3.

We switch to the definitions of the Renyi entanglement entropy and the area law.

Definition 3 (Renyi entanglement entropy)**.** The Renyi entanglement entropy $S_\alpha (0 < \alpha < 1)$ of a bipartite (pure) quantum state ρ_{AB} is defined as

$$S_\alpha(\rho_A) = (1-\alpha)^{-1} \log \mathrm{tr} \rho_A^\alpha, \tag{1}$$

where $\rho_A = \mathrm{tr}_B \rho_{AB}$ is the reduced density matrix. Two limits are of special interest:

$$S_0(\rho_A) := \lim_{\alpha \to 0^+} S_\alpha(\rho_A) \tag{2}$$

is the logarithm of the Schmidt rank, and

$$S_1(\rho_A) := \lim_{\alpha \to 1^-} S_\alpha(\rho_A) = -\mathrm{tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A) \tag{3}$$

is simply referred to as the entanglement entropy.

The entanglement entropy is the most popular entanglement measure (for pure states) in quantum information and condensed matter theory.

Definition 4 (area law for S_α)**.** A (pure) state on a lattice satisfies area laws if for any region A,

$$S_\alpha(\rho_A) = O(|\partial A|), \tag{4}$$

where ρ_A is the reduced density matrix of the region A, and ∂A is the set of the edges of the lattice connecting the region A and its complement.

Since S_α is a monotonically decreasing function of α, area laws for S_{α_1} are more stringent than those for S_{α_2} if $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2$. In 1D, bounded (or even logarithmic divergence of) S_0 across all bipartite cuts implies efficient exact (up to the truncation of real numbers) MPS representations [29]; bounded (or logarithmic divergence of) S_α for $0 < \alpha < 1$ across all cuts implies efficient MPS approximations [27]. See [25] for an extensive discussion of the relation between the scaling of the Renyi entanglement entropy and efficient MPS approximations in 1D quantum systems.

3 Main results

In this section, we prove our main result: The 2D lattice Hamiltonian problem with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws is QMA-complete. Recall that $\lambda(\cdot)$ denotes the ground-state energy of a Hamiltonian.

Theorem 1. *We are given a 1D lattice Hamiltonian $H' = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} H'_{i,i+1}$, where $H'_{i,i+1}$ with $\|H'_{i,i+1}\| \leq 1$ acts on the spins i and $i+1$ (nearest-neighbor interaction). Then, a 2D square lattice Hamiltonian H can be efficiently constructed such that:*
(a) $|\lambda(H) - 2\lambda(H') - a| \leq \delta$, where a is a real number that can be efficiently computed, and $\delta = 1/\mathrm{poly}(n)$ is some inverse polynomial in n;
(b) The ground state $|\psi\rangle$ of H satisfies area laws for $S_\alpha (0 < \alpha \leq 1)$;
(c) H is translationally invariant if and only if H' is translationally invariant.

Proof. We construct H by stacking layers of H' so that H is translationally invariant in the direction perpendicular to the layers. We then introduce strong interlayer coupling so that H is almost trivial in the bulk. The (almost) trivial bulk "dilutes" the entanglement and implies area laws. The edges of H are nontrivial and reproduce the physics of H'.

We now give the detailed construction. Suppose H' acts on a chain of n spin-$(d/2 - 1/2)$, i.e., the local dimension of each spin is $d = O(1)$. Then, the Hamiltonian H acts on a 2D square lattice of size $n \times n$, and at each lattice site there are two spins of local dimension d (you may combine these two spins into a single spin of squared local dimension d^2 if you prefer one spin per site). We label all spins by three indices i, j, k for $1 \leq i, j \leq n,\ k = 1, 2$. The coupling between the spins (i, j, k) and (i', j', k') is denoted by $H_{i,j,k,i',j',k'}$ which is nonzero only if $|i - i'| + |j - j'| = 1$ (nearest-neighbor interaction). The terms within each layer are given by

$$H_{i,j,k,i+1,j,k} = H'_{i,i+1} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1,\ 1 \leq j \leq n,\ k = 1, 2. \tag{5}$$

The terms between adjacent layers are given by

$$H_{i,j,2,i,j+1,1} = (\vec{S}_{i,j,2} \cdot \vec{S}_{i,j+1,1} + d^2/4 - 1/4)\Omega(n^3/\delta) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n,\ 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \tag{6}$$

where $\vec{S}_{i,j,k} = (S^x_{i,j,k}, S^y_{i,j,k}, S^z_{i,j,k})$ is a vector of spin operators of the spin (i, j, k), and

$$\vec{S}_{i,j,k} \cdot \vec{S}_{i',j',k'} := S^x_{i,j,k} S^x_{i',j',k'} + S^y_{i,j,k} S^y_{i',j',k'} + S^z_{i,j,k} S^z_{i',j',k'} \tag{7}$$

is a physical antiferromagnetic Heisenberg interaction. All other terms are zero. Since

$$2\vec{S}_{i,j,2} \cdot \vec{S}_{i,j+1,1} = (\vec{S}_{i,j,2} + \vec{S}_{i,j+1,1})^2 - \vec{S}^2_{i,j,2} - \vec{S}^2_{i,j+1,1} = (\vec{S}_{i,j,2} + \vec{S}_{i,j+1,1})^2 - (d^2 - 1)/2, \tag{8}$$

the ground state of $H_{i,j,2,i,j+1,1}$ is a singlet (i.e., a state of zero total spin), and $\lambda(H_{i,j,2,i,j+1,1}) = 0$. Clearly, by construction H is translationally invariant in the j direction, and H is translationally invariant in the i direction if and only if H' is translationally invariant. We observe that H is the

sum of $n+1$ terms with pairwise disjoint supports. Specifically, let $H = \sum_{j=0}^{n} H_j$, where on the edges $j = 0, n$,

$$H_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} H_{i,1,1,i+1,1,1} \text{ and } H_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} H_{i,n,2,i+1,n,2} \tag{9}$$

act, respectively, on the spins $(i,1,1)$ and on the spins $(i,n,2)$ for $1 \le i \le n$; in the bulk $1 \le j \le n-1$,

$$H_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (H_{i,j,2,i+1,j,2} + H_{i,j+1,1,i+1,j+1,1}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,j,2,i,j+1,1} \tag{10}$$

acts on the spins $(i,j,2)$ and $(i,j+1,1)$ for $1 \le i \le n$. Hence the ground state $|\psi\rangle = \bigotimes_{j=0}^{n} |\psi_j\rangle$ of H is a product state in the j direction, where $|\psi_j\rangle$ is the ground state of H_j.

We now bound the Renyi entanglement entropy of $|\psi\rangle$. For the ease of presentation, we assume the region A is rectangular. However, it should be clear that area laws hold for an arbitrary region A. Since $|\psi\rangle = \bigotimes_{j=0}^{n} |\psi_j\rangle$ is a product state and the Renyi entropy is additive, we can evaluate the Renyi entanglement entropy of each $|\psi_j\rangle$ and sum them up. Suppose the rectangular region A consists of all spins (i,j,k) with indices $i_1 \le i \le i_2,\ j_1 \le j \le j_2,\ k = 1,2$. Then,
(i) the Renyi entanglement entropy of $|\psi_j\rangle$ for $j \le j_1 - 2$ or $j \ge j_2 + 1$ is exactly zero because such $|\psi_j\rangle$'s do not intersect with the boundary of A;
(ii) the Renyi entanglement entropy of $|\psi_j\rangle$ for $j = j_1 - 1$ or $j = j_2$ is trivially upper bounded by $O(i_2 - i_1)$;
(iii) the Renyi entanglement entropy of $|\psi_j\rangle$ for each $j_1 \le j \le j_2 - 1$ is $O(1)$. This is a straightforward consequence of the area law for the ground state in 1D gapped systems.

Lemma 1 ([13]). *Let $|\Psi\rangle$ be the ground state of the 1D lattice Hamiltonian $\mathbf{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{H}_{i,i+1}$, where $\mathbf{H}_{i,i+1}$ with $\|\mathbf{H}_{i,i+1}\| \le 1$ acts on the spins i and $i+1$ (nearest-neighbor interaction). Suppose the energy gap (i.e., the difference between the smallest and the second smallest eigenvalues) of $\mathbf{H}$ is $\Omega(1)$. Then, the Renyi entanglement entropy $S_\alpha (0 < \alpha \le 1)$ of $|\Psi\rangle$ is $O(1)$ per cut.*

Case (iii) follows from Lemma 1 by noting that $|\psi_j\rangle$ is the ground state of H_j, which becomes a 1D lattice Hamiltonian by combining the spins $(i,j,2)$ and $(i,j+1,1)$ into a single spin for each $1 \le i \le n$. Indeed, after rescaling H_j so that the norm of each term in H_j is $O(1)$, we observe that its energy gap is $\Omega(1)$. Summing up cases (i) (ii) (iii), we obtain the upper bound $O(i_2 - i_1 + j_2 - j_1)$, i.e., a 2D area law for the Renyi entanglement entropy $S_\alpha (0 < \alpha \le 1)$.

We now estimate $\lambda(H)$. Since $H = \sum_{j=0}^{n} H_j$ and the supports of H_j's are pairwise disjoint,

$$\lambda(H) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \lambda(H_j) = 2\lambda(H') + (n-1)\lambda(H_1), \tag{11}$$

where the second step is due to $\lambda(H_0) = \lambda(H_n) = \lambda(H')$ and the translational invariance in the j direction in the bulk. $\lambda(H_1)$ can be estimated using the projection lemma.

Lemma 2 (projection lemma [16]). *Let $\mathbf{H}_1, \mathbf{H}_2$ be two Hamiltonians acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{\|} \oplus H^{\perp}$. Suppose $\mathbf{H}_2|_{\mathcal{H}^{\|}} = 0$ and $\mathbf{H}_2|_{\mathcal{H}^{\perp}} \ge J > 2\|\mathbf{H}_1\|$, where $\mathbf{H}_2|_{\dots}$ is the restriction of $\mathbf{H}_2$ to some subspace. Then,*

$$\lambda(\mathbf{H}_1|_{\mathcal{H}^{\|}}) - \|\mathbf{H}_1\|^2/(J - 2\|\mathbf{H}_1\|) \le \lambda(\mathbf{H}_1 + \mathbf{H}_2) \le \lambda(\mathbf{H}_1|_{\mathcal{H}^{\|}}). \tag{12}$$

In our context, we set

$$H_1 = \mathbf{H}_1 + \mathbf{H}_2 \text{ with } \mathbf{H}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (H_{i,1,2,i+1,1,2} + H_{i,2,1,i+1,2,1}) \text{ and } \mathbf{H}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,1,2,i,2,1}. \tag{13}$$

Since the supports of $H_{i,1,2,i,2,1}$'s are pairwise disjoint, $\lambda(\mathbf{H}_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda(H_{i,1,2,i,2,1}) = 0$, and the ground state $|\phi\rangle$ of $\mathbf{H}_2$ is a product of singlets (unique). $\mathcal{H}^{\|}$ is the 1D subspace spanned by $|\phi\rangle$, and $J = \Omega(n^3/\delta)$ is the energy gap of $\mathbf{H}_2$. Since $\|\mathbf{H}_1\| = O(n)$,

$$\lambda(\mathbf{H}_1|_{\mathcal{H}^{\|}}) = \langle\phi|\mathbf{H}_1|\phi\rangle \Rightarrow |\lambda(H_1) - \langle\phi|\mathbf{H}_1|\phi\rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{H}_1\|^2/(J - 2\|\mathbf{H}_1\|) = O(n^2/J) = \delta/n$$
$$\Rightarrow |\lambda(H) - 2\lambda(H') - a| \leq \delta(n-1)/n \leq \delta \text{ for } a := (n-1)\langle\phi|\mathbf{H}_1|\phi\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Finally, a can be efficiently computed as $|\phi\rangle$ is a product of singlets: The running time is $O(n)$ if H' is not translationally invariant and $O(1)$ if H' is. □

The construction in the proof of Theorem 1 does not imply area laws for S_0 because the bulk of H is only almost trivial but not completely trivial. Practically, this is not a limitation as S_0 (the logarithm of the Schmidt rank) is not continuous and hence not stable with respect to infinitesimal perturbations. In the absence of (c) translational invariance, one can easily construct a completely trivial bulk and area laws for S_0 follow.

The state-of-the-art QMA-completeness result for the 1D lattice Hamiltonian problem is due to Hallgren et al. [10], which is an improvement over a previous work [1].

Lemma 3 ([10])**.** *The 1D lattice Hamiltonian problem (with spin-7/2) is QMA-complete.*

Corollary 1. *The 2D square lattice Hamiltonian problem with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws for $S_\alpha (0 \leq \alpha \leq 1)$ is QMA-complete.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and Lemma 3. Note that Theorem 1(b) also holds for S_0 in the absence of translational invariance. □

Translational invariance is an important physical condition, but from a theoretical perspective it introduces a slight technical complication that we have to address. Usually the computational complexity of a problem is measured with respect to the input size, e.g., a problem is in P if it can be solved in time growing polynomially with the input size. For nontranslationally invariant local Hamiltonians, the input size is a polynomial in the system size (as a polynomial number of terms need to be specified), and hence we may equally use the system size to measure the computational complexity. For translationally invariant local Hamiltonians, however, the input size is the logarithm of the system size (the number of bits to represent the system size), and hence in this case an exponential-time algorithm (with respect to the input size) is "efficient" in the sense that its running time grows polynomially with the system size.

For translationally invariant lattice Hamiltonians, the notion of hardness is $\mathrm{QMA}_{\mathrm{EXP}}$-complete, which for brevity we do not formally define here. Serious readers should go to the original reference [9] for its definition based on quantum Turing machines. Colloquially, $\mathrm{QMA}_{\mathrm{EXP}}$-complete (with respect to the input size) means QMA-complete with respect to the system size. This "definition" is of course imprecise, but you do not lose any conceptual messages in the following if you use it.

Lemma 4 ([9])**.** *The 1D translationally invariant lattice Hamiltonian problem is QMA_{EXP}-complete.*

Corollary 2. *The 2D translationally invariant square lattice Hamiltonian problem with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws for $S_\alpha (0 < \alpha \leq 1)$ is QMA_{EXP}-complete.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1 and Lemma 4. □

4 Further extensions

In this section, we extend previous results to 3D Heisenberg and Hubbard models, which are more physical than generic lattice Hamiltonians.

Lemma 5 ([23]). *The 2D square lattice spin-1/2 Heisenberg Hamiltonian*

$$H' = \sum_{\langle i',j'\rangle} \vec{\sigma}_{i'} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{j'} - \sum_{i'} \vec{h}'_{i'} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{i'} \tag{15}$$

is QMA-complete, where $\langle i', j'\rangle$ denotes nearest neighbors, and $\vec{\sigma}_{i'} = (\sigma^x_{i'}, \sigma^y_{i'}, \sigma^z_{i'})$ is a vector of Pauli matrices at site i'.

Proposition 1. *The 3D cubic lattice spin-1/2 Heisenberg Hamiltonian*

$$H = \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j - \sum_i \vec{h}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_i \tag{16}$$

with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws for the entanglement entropy is QMA-complete.

Proof. Given a 2D Hamiltonian (15), a 3D Hamiltonian (16) can be efficiently constructed such that:
(a) $|\lambda(H) - \lambda(H') + a| \leq \delta$, where a is a real number that can be efficiently computed, and δ is some inverse polynomial in n;
(b) The ground state $|\psi\rangle$ of H satisfies area laws for the entanglement entropy.
Then, Proposition 1 is an immediate consequence of Lemma 5.

We label a site i' in the 2D square lattice by two indices $i' = (i'_x, i'_y)$ and a site i in the 3D cubic lattice by three indices $i = (i_x, i_y, i_z)$, where $1 \leq i'_x, i'_y, i_x, i_y, i_z \leq n$. The field strengths in (15) are upper bounded by a fixed polynomial in n [23]: $|\vec{h}'_{i'}| \leq p(n) = 1/\mathrm{poly}(n)$ for any i'. The site-dependent magnetic fields in (16) are given by

$$\vec{h}_i = \vec{h}'_{(i_x,i_y)} + (0,0,1) \text{ for } i_z = 1, \text{ and } \vec{h}_i = (0,0,n^4p^2/\delta) \text{ for } 2 \leq i_z \leq n. \tag{17}$$

$\lambda(H)$ can be estimated using the projection lemma (Lemma 2). In our context, we set

$$\mathbf{H}_1 = \sum_{\langle i,j\rangle} \vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j - \sum_{i_x,i_y=1}^{n} \vec{h}_{(i_x,i_y,1)} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{(i_x,i_y,1)} \text{ and } \mathbf{H}_2 = (n-1)n^6p^2/\delta - \sum_{i_x,i_y=1}^{n} \sum_{i_z=2}^{n} \vec{h}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_i \tag{18}$$

such that $H = \mathbf{H}_1 + \mathbf{H}_2 - (n-1)n^6p^2/\delta$. Clearly, $\lambda(\mathbf{H}_2) = 0$, and

$$\mathcal{H}^{\|} = \mathrm{span}\{|\phi\rangle : \langle\phi|\sigma^z_i|\phi\rangle = 1,\ \forall 1 \leq i_x, i_y \leq n,\ 2 \leq i_z \leq n\} \text{ with } \dim \mathcal{H}^{\|} = 2^n \tag{19}$$

is the ground-state space of $\mathbf{H}_2$. Let $J = \Omega(n^4p^2/\delta)$ be the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of $\mathbf{H}_2$. Since $\|\mathbf{H}_1\| = O(n^2p)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda(\mathbf{H}_1|_{\mathcal{H}^{\|}}) = \lambda(H') + 3n^3 - 6n^2 + 2n \Rightarrow |\lambda(H) - \lambda(H') + a| \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{H}_1\|^2/(J - 2\|\mathbf{H}_1\|) \leq \delta \text{ for } a := (n-1)n^6p^2/\delta - 3n^3 + 6n^2 - 2n. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

We now bound the entanglement entropy of $|\psi\rangle$. Let P be the projection onto the subspace $\mathcal{H}^{\|}$. Since $|\psi\rangle$ is also the ground state of $\mathbf{H}_1 + \mathbf{H}_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{H}_1\| = \|\mathbf{H}_1\| + \lambda(\mathbf{H}_2) \geq \lambda(\mathbf{H}_1 + \mathbf{H}_2) = \langle\psi|(\mathbf{H}_1 + \mathbf{H}_2)|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|\mathbf{H}_1|\psi\rangle + \langle\psi|\mathbf{H}_2|\psi\rangle \\ &\Rightarrow O(n^2p) = 2\|\mathbf{H}_1\| \geq \langle\psi|\mathbf{H}_2|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|(1-P)\mathbf{H}_2(1-P)|\psi\rangle \geq \Omega(n^4p^2/\delta)\|(1-P)|\psi\rangle\|^2 \\ &\Rightarrow \|(1-P)|\psi\rangle\|^2 = O(n^{-2}p^{-1}\delta) \Rightarrow \||\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle\| = 1/\mathrm{poly}(n) \text{ for } |\phi\rangle = P|\psi\rangle/\|P|\psi\rangle\|. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Clearly, $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{\parallel}$ satisfies area laws for any region A. Therefore, $|\psi\rangle$ also satisfies area laws due to the continuity of the entanglement entropy [19]. □

Lemma 6 ([23]). *The 2D square lattice (fermionic) Hubbard Hamiltonian*

$$H = -\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle,s} a^\dagger_{i,s}a_{j,s} + U\sum_i a^\dagger_{i,\uparrow}a_{j,\uparrow}a^\dagger_{i,\downarrow}a_{j,\downarrow} - \sum_i \vec{h}_i\cdot\vec{\sigma}_i \tag{22}$$

is QMA-complete, where $a^\dagger_{i,s}, a_{i,s}$ are the creation and annihilation operators of spin $s \in \{\uparrow,\downarrow\}$ at site i, and $\vec{\sigma}_i = \sum_{s,s'}(\sigma^x_{ss'},\sigma^y_{ss'},\sigma^z_{ss'})a^\dagger_{i,s}a_{i,s'}$ is a vector of operators with $\sigma^{\cdots}_{ss'}$ the elements of the Pauli matrices.

Proposition 2. *The 3D cubic lattice (fermionic) Hubbard Hamiltonian*

$$H = -\sum_{\langle i,j\rangle,s} a^\dagger_{i,s}a_{j,s} + U\sum_i a^\dagger_{i,\uparrow}a_{j,\uparrow}a^\dagger_{i,\downarrow}a_{j,\downarrow} - \sum_i \vec{h}_i\cdot\vec{\sigma}_i \tag{23}$$

with the restriction that the ground state satisfies area laws for the entanglement entropy is QMA-complete.

Proof. Proposition 2 can be proved in the same way as Proposition 1. □

References

[1] D. Aharonov, D. Gottesman, S. Irani, and J. Kempe. The power of quantum systems on a line. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 287(1):41–65, Apr. 2009.

[2] D. Aharonov and T. Naveh. Quantum NP - a survey. *arXiv:quant-ph/0210077*, Oct. 2002.

[3] I. Arad, A. Kitaev, Z. Landau, and U. Vazirani. An area law and sub-exponential algorithm for 1D systems. *arXiv:1301.1162v1*, Jan. 2013.

[4] A. D. Bookatz. QMA-complete problems. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 14(5):361–383, Apr. 2014.

[5] J. Eisert, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio. Colloquium: Area laws for the entanglement entropy. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 82(1):277–306, Feb. 2010.

[6] M. Fannes, B. Nachtergaele, and R. Werner. Finitely correlated states on quantum spin chains. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 144(3):443–490, Mar. 1992.

[7] Y. Ge and J. Eisert. Area laws and approximations of quantum many-body states. *arXiv:1411.2995*, Nov. 2014.

[8] S. Gharibian, Y. Huang, Z. Landau, and S. W. Shin. Quantum Hamiltonian complexity. *arXiv:1401.3916*, Jan. 2014.

[9] D. Gottesman and S. Irani. The quantum and classical complexity of translationally invariant tiling and Hamiltonian problems. *Theory of Computing*, 9(2):31–116, Jan. 2013.

[10] S. Hallgren, D. Nagaj, and S. Narayanaswami. The local Hamiltonian problem on a line with eight states is QMA-complete. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 13(9):721–750, Sep. 2013.

[11] M. B. Hastings. An area law for one-dimensional quantum systems. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2007(08):P08024, Aug. 2007.

[12] P. Hayden, D. W. Leung, and A. Winter. Aspects of generic entanglement. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 265(1):95–117, Jul. 2006.

[13] Y. Huang. Area law in one dimension: Renyi entropy and degenerate ground states. *arXiv:1403.0327*, Mar. 2014.

[14] Y. Huang. A polynomial-time algorithm for approximating the ground state of 1D gapped Hamiltonians. *arXiv:1406.6355*, Jun. 2014.

[15] A. Kay. Quantum-Merlin-Arthur-complete translationally invariant Hamiltonian problem and the complexity of finding ground-state energies in physical systems. *Physical Review A*, 76(3):030307, Sep. 2007.

[16] J. Kempe, A. Kitaev, and O. Regev. The complexity of the local Hamiltonian problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(5):1070–1097, Mar. 2006.

[17] A. Y. Kitaev, A. H. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi. *Classical and Quantum Computation*. American Mathematical Society, 2002.

[18] Z. Landau, U. Vazirani, and T. Vidick. An efficient algorithm for finding the ground state of 1D gapped local Hamiltonians. In *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 301–302, Jan. 2014.

[19] M. A. Nielsen. Continuity bounds for entanglement. *Physical Review A*, 61(6):064301, Apr. 2000.

[20] R. Oliveira and B. M. Terhal. The complexity of quantum spin systems on a two-dimensional square lattice. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 8(10):900–924, Nov. 2008.

[21] T. J. Osborne. Hamiltonian complexity. *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 75(2):022001, Feb. 2012.

[22] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac. Matrix product state representations. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 7(5):401–430, Jul. 2007.

[23] N. Schuch and F. Verstraete. Computational complexity of interacting electrons and fundamental limitations of density functional theory. *Nature Physics*, 5(10), Oct. 2009.

[24] N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac. Computational complexity of projected entangled pair states. *Physical Review Letters*, 98(14):140506, Apr. 2007.

[25] N. Schuch, M. M. Wolf, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac. Entropy scaling and simulability by matrix product states. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(3):030504, Jan. 2008.

[26] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac. Renormalization algorithms for quantum-many body systems in two and higher dimensions. *arXiv:cond-mat/0407066*, Jul. 2004.

[27] F. Verstraete and J. I. Cirac. Matrix product states represent ground states faithfully. *Physical Review B*, 73(9):094423, Mar. 2006.

[28] F. Verstraete, V. Murg, and J. Cirac. Matrix product states, projected entangled pair states, and variational renormalization group methods for quantum spin systems. *Advances in Physics*, 57(2):143–224, Mar. 2008.

[29] G. Vidal. Efficient classical simulation of slightly entangled quantum computations. *Physical Review Letters*, 91(14):147902, Oct. 2003.

[30] G. Vidal. Entanglement renormalization. *Physical Review Letters*, 99(22):220405, Nov. 2007.

[31] G. Vidal. Class of quantum many-body states that can be efficiently simulated. *Physical Review Letters*, 101(11):110501, Sep. 2008.

[32] S. R. White. Density matrix formulation for quantum renormalization groups. *Physical Review Letters*, 69(19):2863–2866, Nov. 1992.

[33] S. R. White. Density-matrix algorithms for quantum renormalization groups. *Physical Review B*, 48(14):10345–10356, Oct. 1993.